COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY) WINCHESTER FARM, 395, HATFIELD ROAD, ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

VOLUME 6. Part 8
pp. 225-256

23rd July 1952

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

24 JUL 1952

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology : Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 225

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases 226

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1952

Price Ten Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : (*Vacant*)

Vice-President and Acting President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar : Mr. A. S. Pankhurst, C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 6, Part 8 (pp. 225-256) 23rd July 1952

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 6, Part 8) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use of the plenary powers is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Vol. 6, Part 8) in relation to the following names:—

(1) *Ancylus* Müller, 1774 (Cl. Gastropoda), designation of type species for, in harmony with established practice (Z.N.(S.)240).

(2) *atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 (as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox*) (Cl. Reptilia, Order Squamata), validation of (Z.N.(S.)523).

(3) *polysticta* Cope, 1865 (as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta*) (Cl. Reptilia, Order Squamata), validation of (Z.N.(S.)524)

(4) *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903 (Cl. Insecta, Order Siphonaptera), designation of type species for, in harmony with established practice (Z.N.(S.)627).

FRANCIS HEMMING

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W 1, England.

23*rd July*, 1952.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENUS "ANCYLUS" MÜLLER, 1774 (CLASS GASTROPODA) IN HARMONY WITH ESTABLISHED NOMENCLATORIAL PRACTICE

By BENGT HUBENDICK

(*Riksmuseum, Stockholm, Sweden*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)240)

The object of the present application is to seek the assistance of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, through the use of its plenary powers, in securing that the type species of the genus *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (Class Gastropoda), shall be the species commonly accepted as such and to avoid the confusion which would result from the strict application of the normal rules in this case. That confusion would be extremely serious, for under the normal rules it would be necessary to abandon the term "*Ancylus*-See" which is universally used to denote a well-known former limnic stage of the Baltic and is so deeply entrenched in the literature of European geology that its abandonment would be open to the strongest possible objection and must, indeed, be regarded as entirely impracticable.

2. The generic name *Ancylus* was first published in 1767 by Geoffroy on pages 13 and 124 of his *Traité sommaire des Coquilles . . . qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris.* Geoffroy placed what he regarded as one species only in this genus but he did not cite it under a binominal name. The description which he gave is so vague that the species which he had in mind might have been either the species now commonly treated as having already been named *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 783) or the later named species *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (*Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 201). Geoffroy stated however that the species in question was the only one known in the neighbourhood of Paris and this suggests that that species was the common *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller. This inference is supported by the fact that Geoffroy cited (1) Lister (1678, *Hist. Anim. Angl.* : 151, pl. 2, fig. 32), (2) Gualtieri (1742, *Index Test. Conch.* : pl. 2, fig. AA), and (3) d'Argenville (1780, *Conch.* **2** : 1, pls. 8, 27), for the figures given by all of these authors appear to represent the foregoing species. On the other hand, Geoffroy cited also the description of *Patella lacustris* published by Linnaeus in 1746 (*Faun. svec.* (ed. 1) : 369) and again in 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 783). There has however been discussion in the past as to the identity of the species to which Linnaeus applied this name. Jeffreys (1862, *Brit. Conch.* **1** : 123), for example, and Woodward (B.B.) (1903, *J. Conch.* **10** : 361) pointed out that the description given by Linnaeus applied as well to the species *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller as to that to which the name *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758, is commonly applied ; the figures cited by Linnaeus appear to depict *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, and that species alone is represented in the Linnean collection. It was for reasons of this order that nearly one hundred years ago Forbes & Hanley (1852, *Hist. Brit. Moll.* **4** : 188) and Hanley (1855, *Ipsa Linnaei Conchylia* :

426) applied the trivial name *lacustris* Linnaeus to the species named *fluviatilis* by Müller. In recent times other authors, including Kennard & Woodward (1920, *J. linn. Soc. Lond.* (Zool.) **34** : 210) have taken the opposite view, holding either that the species which Müller identified as *Ancylus lacustris* (Linnaeus) was in fact the species to which Linnaeus in 1758 had given the name *Patella lacustris* or that, notwithstanding the dissimilarity of that species from *Ancylus fluviatilis*, Linnaeus had confused the two species together and therefore that his nominal species *Patella lacustris* was a composite species. It may, therefore, be the case that Geoffroy had in mind only one species, namely *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, when in 1767, he used the generic name *Ancylus*. As we shall see, however, the name *Ancylus*, as used by Geoffroy, is an invalid name. The sense in which he applied it has, therefore, no nomenclatorial significance, being of historical interest only. As to the trivial name *lacustris* Linnaeus, there is no doubt that Müller (1774) applied it to the first of the two species which may have been comprised in it by Linnaeus, for to the second of those species he then gave the name *Ancylus fluviatilis*. It is in accordance with the interpretation of Müller that the name *lacustris* Linnaeus is now generally used and it is in this sense that the nominal species *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus is today accepted as the type species of *Acroloxus* Beck, 1837 (see paragraph 7 below).

3. There have in the past been differences of opinion among specialists on the question whether in his *Traité sommaire* of 1767 Geoffroy applied the principles of " nomenclature binaire " (as prescribed, up to 1948, by Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the *Règles*) and therefore as to whether new names published by Geoffroy in the foregoing work acquired thereby any rights under the Law of Priority. Fortunately, all scope for further argument regarding the meaning to be attached to the above Proviso to Article 25 was put an end to in Paris in 1948 when the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the International Commission, (1) gave a ruling that the expression " nomenclature binaire," as hitherto used in the *Règles*, had a meaning identical with that attaching to the expression " nomenclature binominale," and (2) decided to substitute the latter entirely unambiguous expression for the expression " nomenclature binaire," wherever that expression had formerly appeared in the *Règles* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66). During the same session the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature decided that, in accordance with the foregoing decision, another work by Etienne Louis Geoffroy [1727-1810], his *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, failed to comply with the requirements of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25, by reason of the fact that in that work Geoffroy had not " appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale " (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 366-369). The system of nomenclature in the *Traité sommaire* is identical with that used both earlier (in 1762) and later (in 1799-1800) in the two editions of the *Histoire abrégée*. It follows, therefore, that under the decisions cited above new names in the *Traité sommaire* possess no rights under the Law of Priority in virtue of having been so published. In order however to put a stop to the risk of further discussion on this subject, it would be convenient if the International Commission were now to give a formal ruling to the foregoing effect, so that the *Traité sommaire* may be added to the list of works rejected for non-compliance with Proviso (*b*) to Article 25.

4. Having now established that the name *Ancylus* Geoffroy, 1767, is not an available name, we have to determine what was the next subsequent occasion on which the name *Ancylus* was published as a generic name. This was in 1774, when it was so used by O. F. Müller (*Ancylus* Müller, 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 199). Müller, who employed the Linnean binominal system of nomenclature, cited two nominal species as belonging to this genus, namely : (1) *Ancylus lacustris* (Linnaeus, 1758) (=*Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758), and (2) the new nominal species *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller (: 201). One or other of these two nominal species must therefore be the type species of *Ancylus* Müller.

5. It is now known that the first type selection for this genus was made in 1823 by Children (*Quart. J. Sci. Lit. Arts* **15** : 231), who so selected the nominal species *Ancylus lacustris* (Linnaeus). This selection was completely overlooked at the time and this species later became one of the originally included species of the nominal genus *Acroloxus* Beck, 1837 (*Index Moll. Mus. Christ. Freder.* : 124), to which it is still commonly referred and of which it was selected as the type species by Herrmannsen in 1846 (*Indic. Gen. Malacoz. Primordia* **1** : 16).

6. The next selection of a type species for the genus *Ancylus* Müller was by Gray in 1847 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **15** : 181), when the nominal species *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, 1774, was so selected. Ever since that date, the name *Ancylus* has been generally used for the genus which includes this species. Moreover, it is upon the basis of this type selection that the name *Ancylus* has been employed in the term " *Ancylus*-See " by Baltic geologists to denote the stage of the Baltic Sea when this genus occurred in that area. Among the important recent authors by whom the name *Ancylus* has been used in the foregoing sense may be noted Thiele (1931, *Handbuch der syst. Weichtierkunde* **1** (Pt. 2) : 482 ; 1935, *ibid.* **2** (Pt. 4) : 1151), who maintained that this usage was correct.

7. Some modern authors have however used the name *Ancylus* for the species selected as the type species by Children. This has led to great confusion, for it has not only involved the transfer of the generic name *Ancylus* from the genus containing *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, for which it is so well known as a name, to the genus hitherto always known as *Acroloxus* Beck, but, in addition, has deprived of its meaning the term " *Ancylus*-See," since *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, which, on this transfer, becomes the type species of *Ancylus*, did not occur in the limnic stage of the Baltic to which the term " *Ancylus*-See " is always applied. It is for the purpose of putting an end to this state of confusion that the International Commission is now asked to use its plenary powers to designate *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, 1774, as the type species of the genus *Ancylus* Müller, 1774.

8. For the reasons set forth above, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to stabilise the nomenclature of the two genera here under discussion in the following manner, that is, that the Commission should :—

(1) give a ruling that in the work entitled *Traité sommaire des Coquilles . . . qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, published in 1767 (as

in the *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, published in 1762 and republished in 1799-1800) Geoffroy (E.L.) did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the *Règles*, as amended by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, and therefore that no name acquired availability under the Law of Priority in virtue of being so published ;

(2) use its plenary powers (*a*) to set aside all type selections for the genus *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774, made the decision now proposed prior to to be taken, and (*b*) to designate *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller (O.F.), 1774, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(3) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;—

(*a*) *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by designation, as proposed under (2) (*b*) above, under the plenary powers : *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller (O.F.), 1774) ;

(*b*) *Acroloxus* Beck, 1837 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by selection by Herrmannsen 1846) : *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758, as interpreted by Müller (O.F.), 1774 : 199-200) ;

(4) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;—

(*a*) *fluviatilis* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (as published in the binominal combination *Ancylus fluviatilis*) (trivial name of species proposed, under (2) (*b*) above, to be designated, under the plenary powers, as the type species of *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774) ;

(*b*) *lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Patella lacustris*), the species so named to be interpreted as specified in (3) (*b*) above (trivial name of type species of *Acroloxus* Beck, 1837) ;

(5) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the generic name *Ancylus* Geoffroy, 1767 (name published in a work rejected as not complying with the requirements of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the *Règles*).

PROPOSED ADDITION OF THE NAME " ANCYLASTRUM " BOURGUIGNAT, 1853 (CLASS GASTROPODA) TO THE " OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY "

By BENGT HUBENDICK

(*Riksmuseum, Stockholm, Sweden*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)546)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to place the well-known generic name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, 1853 (type species, by subsequent selection : *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat, 1853) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

2. The name *Ancylastrum* was introduced into the literature by Bourguignat as the name of a subgenus of the genus *Ancylus* (for which name Bourguignat did not cite an author). On the first publication of this name which occurred in the first part of a paper published in instalments and which was issued on 15th February 1853 (*J. Conchyliol.* **4** : 63) Bourguignat briefly defined this subgenus but did not refer any species to it by name. In the second part of his paper, published on 1st May 1853, Bourguignat cited the species which he regarded as belonging to this subgenus and expressly stated that its type species was *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus*, a new species then named and briefly characterised for the first time (: 170). The full description of this new species was reserved for a paper then in preparation for publication in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, and was published early in the following year ([1854], *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **21** : 91). In that paper Bourguignat repeated the statement that the above species was the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat.

3. The validity of Bourguignat's action in selecting *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat to be the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat has in the past been challenged on two quite different grounds, as follows :—

(1) Some authors have rejected the above species as the type species on the ground that it was not eligible for selection as such, since the specific name *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat had not been published when on 15th February 1853 the subgeneric name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat was first published.

(2) Other authors have advanced the view that the name *Ancylastrum* was published by Bourguignat as the name of the typical subgenus of the genus *Ancylus* and therefore that, notwithstanding the designation by Bourguignat of *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat as the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, the type species of that subgenus must be *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, 1774, that species having been selected by Gray (1847) as the type species of the genus *Ancylus*, as restricted by Gray, it being impossible under the *Règles* for the typical subgenus of a genus to have, as its type species, any species, other than the type species of the genus itself.

4. We may conveniently examine first the contention that the species *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat, May 1853, is ineligible for selection as the type species of the subgenus *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, February 1853. As we have seen (paragraph 2 above) the subgeneric name *Ancylastrum* was first published by Bourguignat in February 1853 without any nominal species cited by name as belonging thereto. Accordingly, up till July 1948, the species which should be treated as the type species of this subgenus fell to be decided in accordance with the provisions of the Commission's *Opinion* 46 (1912, *Smithson. Publ.* **2060** : 104-107), those being the only provisions in the *Règles* and the *Opinions*, taken together, that dealt with this subject. The extensive discussions which have taken place in regard to the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat are, no doubt, due, in part, to the fact, as the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature itself recognised in Paris in July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 159), the obscurities and self-contradictions in *Opinion* 46 were such that in many cases it had proved

impossible to deduce from that *Opinion* what species should, under the *Règles*, be regarded as the type species of any given genus originally established without any nominal species cited as belonging thereto. It was to remedy this defect that the International Commission in 1948 cancelled the foregoing *Opinion* and recommended to the Congress that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that where, prior to 1st January 1931, a generic name was published for a genus established (*a*) with an indication, definition or description, (*b*) with no nominal species distinctly referred to it, the first nominal species to be subsequently so referred to it by the same or another author is, or are, to be deemed to have been originally included species, that, where one such species only is so cited that species automatically becomes the type species of the genus concerned and that, where two or more such species are cited but none is designated or indicated as the type species of the genus concerned, those species become, for the purposes of Article 30 the sole originally included species, from which alone therefore the type species of the genus may be selected by a subsequent author (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 160, 346). This recommendation was approved by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 131) ; the provision so recommended and approved is therefore that which governs the determination of the type species of the subgenus *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat. Applying that provision to this case, we find that Bourguignat himself in May 1853 was the first author to refer any nominal species to the subgenus *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, February 1853, and that on that occasion he designated one of the nominal species so referred, namely *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat, May 1853 (a species then named and briefly diagnosed for the first time) to be the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, February 1853. Under the decision taken by the International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948 that species is therefore unquestionably the validly designated type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, 1853.

5. The second of the two arguments advanced against the acceptance of the foregoing species as the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat is disposed of, equally with the first argument, by the decision taken by the Paris Congress discussed above, for that decision is unequivocal and unqualified in its terms. It is therefore not necessary to examine the second argument in detail. It must be noted, however, that that argument would have been equally ill-founded, even if Bourguignat had cited *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* at the time when he first published the name *Ancylastrum* and had not designated that species as the type species, some later author having so selected it, for in that case also that species would have been the validly determined type species of *Ancylastrum*. For it is the Rules in Article 30 which alone govern the determination of the type species of a genus. It is true that the *Règles* provide (Article 9) that the nominotypical subgenus of a genus (i.e. the subgenus containing the type species of the genus) automatically takes, as its name, the name of the genus itself, but that provision in no way impinges upon, or qualifies the effect of, the provisions of Article 30. If for the moment we assume that Bourguignat gave the name *Ancylastrum* to the nominotypical subgenus of the genus *Ancylus*, the effect of his action would not have been to nullify the type designation made by Bourguignat for his subgenus *Ancylastrum* ; it would have been entirely different, namely to make the subgeneric

name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat either an objective or a subjective synonym of the name *Ancylus*, the valid name of the nominotypical subgenus of the genus *Ancylus*, (i) an objective synonym if the type species of *Ancylastrum* had been the same nominal species as that of *Ancylus*, (ii) a subjective synonym if the two type species were species which specialists subjectively considered to be congeneric with one another. As a matter of fact, however, Bourguignat did not publish the subgeneric name *Ancylastrum* for the nominotypical genus of the genus *Ancylus*, for, as I have shown in the separate application which I have submitted to the International Commission in regard to the generic name *Ancylus* (application Z.N.(S.)240), the type species of that genus, under the *Règles*, is not *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, 1774 (the species treated as the type species of that genus by all those who have challenged the position of *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat as the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat) but the entirely different species *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758 (now commonly referred to the genus *Acroloxus* Beck, 1837, of which also it is the type species). From every point of view, therefore, the argument against the acceptance of *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat as the type species of *Ancylastrum* on the ground that that name was published for the nominotypical subgenus of *Ancylus*, is entirely misconceived and without foundation.

6. Having now clearly established that *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat, May 1853, is the validly determined type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, February 1853, we have finally to note that the name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat is itself an available name in the sense that it is not a homonym of any earlier generic or subgeneric name consisting of the same word and that there is no genus or subgenus, possessing an earlier and available name that has, as its type species, the same nominal species or some other nominal species that is subjectively identified by specialists with that species or is considered congeneric with that species. The name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, 1853, is therefore qualified in every respect for admission to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

7. In order, therefore, to promote stability in the nomenclature of this group by putting an end to fruitless discussion regarding the type species of the genus *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, I now ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to place the generic name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, February 1853 (gender of generic name : neuter) (type species, by designation by Bourguignat (May 1853) : *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus* Bourguignat, May 1853) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.;

(2) to place the trivial name *cumingianus* Bourguignat, 1853 (as published in the combination *Ancylus* (*Ancylastrum*) *cumingianus*) (trivial name of the type species of *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, 1853) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PRESERVE FOR THE WESTERN DIAMOND RATTLESNAKE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ATROX" BAIRD & GIRARD, 1853 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "CROTALUS ATROX") BY SUPPRESSING THE TRIVIAL NAME "CINEREOUS" LE CONTE IN HALLOWELL, 1852 (AS PUBLISHED IN COMBINATION "CROTALUS CINEREOUS") (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER SQUAMATA)

By LAURENCE M. KLAUBER

(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)523)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to preserve the well-known trivial name *atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 (as published in the binominal combination *Crotalus atrox*) for the western diamond rattlesnake by the use of its plenary powers to suppress the earlier trivial name *cinereous* Le Conte *in* Hallowell, 1852 (as published in the combination *Crotalus cinereous*) (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata).

2. In 1852, Hallowell (: 177) described the rattlesnake *Crotalus lecontei*. This nominal species has since seldom been recognised as valid, its name being usually considered a synonym of *Crotalus confluentus* Say, 1823, or, more recently, of *Crotalus viridis* Rafinesque, 1818. This disposition of *lecontei* Hallowell is undoubtedly correct, as was demonstrated by Stejneger in do Amaral, 1929 (: 87). The validity of *lecontei* has no bearing on the question herein raised.

3. In the course of his description of *lecontei*, Hallowell included the following paragraph :—

> "*Remarks.* My friend Dr. Le Conte informs me that he found near the Colorado, about seven hundred miles from the last mentioned locality, a species of crotalus which was very abundant in that region ; over four feet in length, and which appears to be the same as the one above described. He took the following notes of it upon the spot : 'Crotalus-cinereous ; black with a series of subrhomboidal spots margined with dark brown, and exterior to this a line of white scales ; sides with a few darker cinereous spots ; beneath pale ochraceous ; neck and upper part of head white ; tail white with four black rings,* becoming irregular beneath length 4½ ft. ; greatest circumference 5½ inches ; 185 transverse scales beneath the body, 28 caudal ; fourteen scales in the oblique rows from spine to side in middle and on neck ; nine posteriorly and on tail. Colorado, March, 1851. The dorsal spots became indistinct behind. Sandy deserts.'" [This extract from Le Conte occurs on page 177.]

4. In 1854, Hallowell repeated his description of *lecontei* and again repeated under "Remarks" the quotation from Le Conte's communication. In this reprint the words *Crotalus cinereous* were italicised and the hyphen was omitted, and there were several other minor changes, including the change of the word "black," after the name, to "back."

*In a young specimen brought by Dr. Woodhouse these four black rings are very distinct.

5. As I have discussed elsewhere (Klauber, 1936 : 194), although Hallowell thought that Le Conte's *cinereous* was the same as the rattlesnake that he (Hallowell) was describing as *C. lecontei*, actually it was a quite different snake. For the description and the type locality, the Colarado [Desert], leave no question but that the description covers the western diamond rattlesnake *Crotalus atrox* Baird and Girard, 1853 (: 5).

6. It seems to me that, although Hallowell had no such intention, his inclusion of Le Conte's manuscript name and description constitutes a valid description under *Opinion* 4 of the Commission, as further discussed in vol. 1, part 13, pp. 103-114, of the *Opinions and Declarations*, 1944 ; and that the name *Crotalus cinereous* Le Conte in Hallowell, 1852, anticipates *Crotalus atrox* Baird and Girard, 1853. Gloyd (1940 : 205) has taken a contrary view, primarily because of the inclusion of the dash and the lack of italics in the first publication of Le Conte's manuscript description.

7. Although I sought to establish *Crotalus cinereous* as the proper name of the western diamond rattlesnake in 1936, at a time when no official means were available for the conservation of trivial names, I am quite willing to withdraw from that position, now that a procedure for such conservation has been duly established. Therefore I suggest that this question be finally settled by stabilising the long-established and currently utilised name *atrox* Baird & Girard for this species. It is important that this be done, since the name *atrox* is employed not only by systematists, but likewise also extensively by the medical profession, for the western diamond rattlesnake in the United States. The concrete proposals now submitted are that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *cinereous* Le Conte *in* Hallowell, 1852 (as published in the binominal combination *Crotalus cinereous*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the trivial name *atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 (as published in the binominal combination *Crotalus atrox*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology :*

(3) place the trivial name *cinereous* Le Conte *in* Hallowell, 1852 (as published in the binominal combination *Crotalus cinereous*), as proposed, in (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

References

Baird, Spencer F. and Girard, Charles, 1853. Catalogue of North American Reptiles in the Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. Part 1.—Serpents, pp. xvi + 172.

Do Amaral, Afranio, 1929. On *Crotalus confluentus* Say, 1823, and its Allied Forms. *Bull. Antivenin Inst. Amer.*, **2** (4) : 86-97.

Gloyd, Howard K., 1940. The Rattlesnakes, Genera *Sistrurus* and *Crotalus*. *Chicago Acad. Sci.*, Spec. Publ . **4** : pp. vii + 270.

Hallowell, Edward, 1852. Descriptions of New Species of Reptiles Inhabiting North America. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.*, **4** (5) : 177-182.

——, 1854. Reptiles : in " Report of an Expedition down the Zuni and Colorado Rivers " by Captain L. Sitgreaves. Washington, pp. 106-152.

Klauber, Laurence M., 1936. A Key to the Rattlesnakes with Summary of Characteristics. *Trans. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.*, **8** (20) : 185-276.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PRESERVE THE TRIVIAL NAME " POLYSTICTA " COPE, 1865 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CAUDISONA POLYSTICTA ") FOR THE MEXICAN LANCE-HEADED RATTLESNAKE, BY SUPPRESSING THE TRIVIAL NAME " MULTIMACULATA " JAN, 1863 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CROTALUS LUGUBRIS VAR. MULTIMACULATA ") (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER SQUAMATA)

By LAURENCE M. KLAUBER

(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)524)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *multimaculata* Jan, 1863 (as published in the combination *Crotalus lugubris* var. *multimaculata*) (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata), thereby preserving the trivial name *polysticta* Cope, 1865 (as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta*), the name now and for many years universally employed (in the combination *Crotalus polystictus*) for the Mexican lanceheaded rattlesnake. The details of this case are set out in the following paragraphs.

2. In 1865, Cope (: 191) described the Mexican lance-headed rattlesnake as *Caudisona polysticta*, and this name has been almost universally applied (in the combination *Crotalus polystictus*) to this snake ever since. Indeed, there has since been only a single synonym allocated to this species, this being *Crotalus jimenezii* Dugès, 1877 (: 23). Yet without doubt, under a strict interpretation of the Rules, the proper name for this snake is *Crotalus multimaculatus* Jan, 1863.

3. In 1859, Jan (pp. 153, 156 ; or, in separate form, pp. 28, 30, 31) described *Crotalus lugubris* based on four syntypes, two of which were in the Milan collection, one in the Westphal-Castelnau collection, and one in the Natural History Museum in Paris. Jan's nominal species *Crotalus lugubris* was a composite. The two Milan specimens belonged to the species now known as *Crotalus triseriatus* Wagler, 1830 (: 176), and the Paris specimen probably did likewise. But the Westphal-Castelnau specimen belonged to the same species as Cope's *Crotalus polystictus*, as can be readily determined from a figure of this specimen that appeared later (1874, Jan and Sordelli **46** : pl. III, fig. 3).

4. In 1940 in an endeavour to protect Cope's name *polystictus* from becoming a junior synonym of the older name *lugubris* of Jan, I selected one of the Milan specimens as the lectotype of *lugubris*, thus placing the latter in the synonymy of *triseriatus* Wagler, 1830 (Klauber : 17). In 1939 I corresponded with Dr. Guiseppe Scortecci of the Museo Civico de Storia Naturale of Milan, from whom I ascertained that Jan's two specimens were still available (they were subsequently destroyed in the war), and I then secured photographs of the better preserved of the two, this being the specimen numbered " Milan 1414." From these pictures it was possible to determine that this specimen was conspecific with *Crotalus triseriatus* Wagler, as the latter nominal species has been interpreted during the past 100 years or more. Thus, by making the specimen " Milan 1414 " the lectotype of *Crotalus lugubris* Jan, 1859, this name was eliminated as a possible antecedent of *polystictus* Cope, 1865.

5. In 1863, Jan (: 124) published the trivial name *multimaculata* for a variety [subspecies] of *Crotalus lugubris*. I have previously stated (1940 : 17) that this was a *nomen nudum*, but I now believe this to have been an error ; for Jan, although supplying no description of *multimaculata* in his 1863 publication, lists the Westphal specimen as the type specimen of *multimaculata* and this is certainly an " indication " under Art. 25a (see also 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 149). The " indication " is, of course, to the description of the Westphal specimen that appeared in 1859 (p. 157, or p. 32 of the separate), which description, giving dimensions and some scale counts, was as complete as many of the old snake descriptions that are deemed valid today. Thus, in summary, we have a name applied to a specimen previously described, all of which appeared in print prior to the advent of the trivial name *polysticta*, Cope, 1865.

6. Hence I believe that, under a strict application of the Rules, the correct name for the Mexican lance-headed rattlesnake is *Crotalus multimaculatus* (Jan, 1863), of which the name *Crotalus polystictus* (Cope, 1865) becomes a subjective junior synonym. The displacement in this way of the trivial name *polystictus* would be highly undesirable, as that name has been used consistently and almost universally for this snake for many years, while the name *multimaculatus* Jan is virtually unknown in the literature. Therefore I believe that this is a case where the Commission should use its plenary powers for the purpose of preventing the confusion which would follow the strict application of the Rules, now that it has been given extended powers for the protection of trivial names in common use.

7. The concrete proposals which are therefore now submitted are that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, the trivial name *multimaculata* Jan, 1863 (as published in the combination *Crotalus lugubris* var. *multimaculata*) ;

(2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ;—*

(*a*) *polysticta* Cope, 1865 (as published in the binominal combination *Caudisona polysticta*) ;

(*b*) *triseriatus* Wagler, 1830 (as published in the binominal combination *Uropsophus triseriatus*) ;

(3) place the trivial name *multimaculata* Jan, 1863 (as published in the combination *Crotalus lugubris* var. *multimaculata*) as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

References

Cope, Edward D., 1865. Third Contribution to the Herpetology of Tropical America. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **17** : 185-198.

Dugès, Alfredo, 1877. Apuntes para la Monografía de los Crotalos de México. *La Naturaleza* **4** : 1-29.

Jan, Georg, 1859. Plan d'une Iconographie descriptive des Ophidiens. *Revue et Magasin de Zoologie* (2) **10** [part 4] : 148-157.

——. Prodrome d'une Iconographie descriptive des Ophidiens. Paris, pp. 1-32 [a modified separate of the above ; see H. M. Smith (1943, *Trans. Kansas Acad. Sci.* **46** : 241-242)].

——, 1863. Elenco Sistematico degli Ofidi. Milano, pp. 1-143

Jan, Georg, and Sordelli, Ferdinand, 1860-81. Iconographie générale des Ophidiens. Milan and Paris, text pp. 1-100, and atlas of 3 volumes.

Klauber, Laurence M., 1940. Notes from a Herpetological Diary, II. *Copeia* **1940** (1) : 15-18.

Wagler, Johann G., 1830. Natürliches System der Amphibien. München, Stuttgart und Tübingen, pp. 1-354.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENUS "PALAEOPSYLLA" WAGNER, 1903 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER SIPHONAPTERA) IN HARMONY WITH THE GENERALLY ACCEPTED USE OF THAT NAME

By G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A.

(*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)627)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to set aside a valid, but overlooked or ignored, selection of a type species for the genus *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903, and to designate as the type species of this genus the species that is universally accepted as such, thus avoiding the serious and quite unnecessary confusion that would inevitably result from the strict application of the normal Rules in this case.

2. Wagner described the genus *Palaeopsylla* in 1903 (*Hor. Soc. ent. ross.* **36** : 137), including in it "drei paläarktische Arten: *P. sibirica* W., *P. dasycnemus* Rothsch. und *P. gracilis* T. Die von mir beschriebene *Typhlopsylla intermedia* . . . muss auch zu der Gattung *Palaeopsylla* gestellt worden." Of the species mentioned by Wagner, *Ctenopsylla sibirica* Wagner, 1898, is now placed in *Amphipsylla* Wagner, 1909, *Typhlopsylla dasycnemus* Rothschild, 1897, in *Doratopsylla* Jordan and Rothschild, 1912, *Typhlopsylla gracilis* Taschenberg, 1880, is referred to *Palaeopsylla* as a synonym of *Palaeopsylla minor* (Dale, 1878), while *Typhlopsylla intermedia* Wagner, 1902, is now in *Tritopsylla* da Cunha, 1929. It is claimed (and the claim was accepted as correct by Wagner) that the species that Wagner described in 1903 (*Hor. Soc. ent. ross.* **36** : 142, pl. 2, fig. 2) as *Palaeopsylla gracilis* Tasch. was not Taschenberg's species but one subsequently described by Dampf in 1910 (*Schr. phys. ökon. Ges. Königs.* **51** : 327, figs. 4, 5d) as *Palaeopsylla similis.*

3. In 1905 (*Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* **29** : 129) Baker included "*Paleopsylla* Wagner (type *sibirica*)" in a key to genera of fleas; the name of the genus is misspelt, but is given correctly on p. 135 of the same paper.

4. No subsequent author has accepted Baker's undoubtedly valid selection of a type species for *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903. Wagner himself (1909, *Bull. Mus. Caucase* **4** : 196, 201)* included "*Typhlopsylla sibirica* Wagn." (i.e. *Ctenopsylla sibirica* Wagner, 1898) in his new genus *Amphipsylla.* Dampf (1910, *Schr. phys. ökon. Ges. Königs.* **51** : 324-330), though not making any assertion as to the type species of *Palaeopsylla* in this excellent review of the genus, included in it only species which are still considered to be congeneric with *Typhlopsylla gracilis* Taschenberg. In his *Katalog der palaearktischen Aphanip-*

*The double page-references to this paper are due to it having been published both in Russian and in German, the first page-reference in each instance being to the Russian version.

teren (1930) Wagner made (: 20) the first assertion as to the type species of *Palaeopsylla* subsequent to that of Baker, giving it as " gen. typ. *similis* " and listing " *gracilis* Wagn. 1902 " (which should be 1903) as an error of determination and a synonym of *Palaeopsylla similis* Dampf, 1910. This selection, though 25 years too late, has (with one exception) been universally accepted, either implicitly or (as in Costa Lima and Hathaway, 1946, *Pulgas, bibliografia, catálogo e animais por elas sugados* : 202) explicitly. The exception is only partial : Stiles and Stanley (1932, *Bull. U.S. nat. Inst. Hlth.* **159** : 836), though stating that the type species of *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903, was *sub judice*, listed under this generic name only species congeneric with *Typhlopsylla gracilis* Taschenberg and *Palaeopsylla similis* Dampf. The statement of Stiles and Stanley that the case was *sub judice* should mean that it had been referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, but this was apparently never done.

5. Reverting to *Amphipsylla*, Wagner (1909 : 196, 201) included in this genus a new species, *A. schelkovnikovi* Wagner, 1909 (: 197, 201), and also *Typhlopsylla sibirica* Wagn., without indicating which of these species he considered to be the type species (the statement of Stiles and Stanley, 1932 : 841, that *A. schelkovnikovi* Wagner is the type species by original designation is incorrect). Jordan and Rothschild (1913, *Zoologist* **1913** (869) : 402), in a paper on the genus *Amphipsylla* Wagner, 1909, stated " Genotype *shelkovnikovi* [sic], Wagn. (1909)." This is undoubtedly a definite type selection, and it would have been effective in preserving *Amphipsylla* Wagner in the sense in which it is universally used but for Baker's prior action in selecting a species (*Ctenopsylla sibirica* Wagner, 1898) that is undoubtedly congeneric with *Amphipsylla schelkovnikovi* Wagner as type species of *Palaeopsylla :* because of Baker's action, however, *Amphipsylla* Wagner, 1909, is a subjective synonym of *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903, under strict application of the *Règles*. No author appears ever to have used the name *Amphipsylla* Wagner for any other group of species than that which includes *Amphipsylla schelkovnikovi* Wagner, 1909.

6. The position is, therefore, that if the *Règles* are to be strictly applied the name *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903, must be transferred from the group of species to which it is universally applied (which would be left nameless) to the group equally universally known as *Amphipsylla* Wagner, 1909, which belongs to a different family. No conceivable purpose could be served by this transfer.

7. In order to avoid the state of chaos that would result from strict application of the *Règles* to this case, I now ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

(*a*) to set aside all designations, indications or selections of a type species for the genus *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903, made prior to the decision now proposed to be given ;

(*b*) to designate *Palaeopsylla similis* Dampf, 1910, to be the type species of *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903 ;

(2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the two names mentioned below :—

(*a*) *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by designation as proposed under (1) (*b*) above, under the plenary powers : *Palacopsylla similis* Dampf, 1910) ;

(*b*) *Amphipsylla* Wagner, 1909 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by designation of Jordan and Rothschild, 1913 : *Amphipsylla schelkovnikovi* Wagner, 1909) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ;*—

(*a*) *similis* Dampf, 1910 (as published in the binominal combination *Palaeopsylla similis*) (trivial name of type species of *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903) ;

(*b*) *schelkovnikovi* Wagner, 1909 (as published in the binominal combination *Amphipsylla schelkovnikovi*) (trivial name of type species of *Amphipsylla* Wagner, 1909).

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY MR. C. W. WRIGHT IN REGARD TO THE NOMINAL GENUS "HOPLITES" NEUMAYR, 1875 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA) AND TO THE DESIGNATION OF ITS TYPE SPECIES

By R. CASEY

(*Geological Survey and Museum, London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)533)

(Extract from a letter dated 5th October, 1951)

I write in support of the application submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Mr. C. W. Wright to validate the name of the nominal genus *Hoplites* Neumayr, 1875, and also to validate Jacob's designation of *Ammonites dentatus* J. Sowerby, 1821, as the type species of the said nominal genus. As a student of Cretaceous ammonites, I am familiar with the case (see Casey, R., 1949, *Geol. Mag.*, **86** : 333, footnote ; 1950, *Proc. Geol. Assoc.*, **61** : 293, footnote) and am of the opinion that the decisions which Mr. Wright proposes that the International Commission should make are in the best interests of nomenclatorial stability.

REQUEST FOR A RULING THAT THE ALLEGED NAME "ANTIRHYNCHONELLA" QUENSTEDT, 1871, IS A "NOMEN NUDUM" (PHYLUM BRACHIOPODA, CLASS ARTICULATA)

By THOMAS W. AMSDEN

(*The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)632)

The present application arises out of the need for determining whether the alleged generic name *Antirhynchonella* Quenstedt, 1871 (Phylum Brachiopoda, Class Articulata) possesses any status in zoological nomenclature. The circumstances of this case are set forth in the following paragraphs.

2. The name *Antirhynchonella* was first published in 1871 in the index at the end of Quenstedt's *Die Brachiopoden, Petrefactenkunde Deutschlands* (**2** : 727). This name was not cited by Quenstedt in the summary which he gave of the genera and subgenera recognised in his work. Nor does it appear on the page (: 231) of volume 2 cited in the index against this name. On the last named page there does however occur the following passage in which this word appears in the vernacular (German) form "Antirhynchonellen" :—

> Aechte Pentameren haben entweder an der Stirn correspondirende Valven, oder Sinus und Wulst ist entgegengesetzt den Rhynchonellen, gleichsam Antirhynchonellen. Selbst die faustgrosse eiförmige tenuistriatus Walmst. auf Gothland, vom Habitus des glatten Esthonus (Eichwald Lethaea ross. I pag. 789) bewahrt diesen markirten Unterschied. Dagegen zeichnen die Engländer einen kleinen glatten Pentamerus linguifer Murch. Siluria 22.21 aus, der seine Zunge entgegengesetzt zur Bauchschale hinauf wendet.

3. The next usage of the name *Antirhynchonella* was by Oehlert in 1887 (*in* Fischer's *Manuel de Conchyliologie* **11** : 1311), where it was attributed to Quenstedt. Oehlert treated it as the name of a section of *Conchidium* and clearly used it as a subgeneric name. Oehlert gave a diagnosis for *Antirhynchonella* and designated *Atrypa linguifera* Sowerby (J. de C.), 1839 (*in* Murchison, *Silurian System* : 629) as the type species, though (following Quenstedt in the passage quoted above) Oehlert incorrectly attributed this name to Murchison.

4. The status of the name *Antirhynchonella* was considered again by Hall & Clarke in 1894 (*Nat. Hist. New York*, Paleontology **2** : 245, footnote) ; these authors seem to have been in some doubt as to whether Quenstedt had used this name in a generic sense, pointing out that in the text he had not used the word as a Latin noun but had referred only to the "Antirhynchonellas," the Latin form appearing only in the index. In spite of this doubt Hall & Clarke apparently decided to accept the name *Antirhynchonella* as an available name as from Quenstedt, but they rejected Oehlert's action in designating *Atrypa linguifera* Sowerby as the type species of this genus for the following reason : "If any species can be taken as typical of ANTIRHYNCHONELLA, it is *Conchidium tenuistriatus* Walmstedt, mentioned in immediate connection with the single use of this name, and not *Pentamerus linguifera*, which is cited by Quenstedt as an illustration of the fact that the position of the fold

and sinus in the pentameroids is sometimes the same as in the Rhynchonellas. *Antirhynchonella*, if adopted, would be simply synonymous with *Conchidium*." Hall & Clarke took the view that the species bearing the trivial name *tenuistriatus* Walmstedt should be referred to the genus *Conchidium* and erected a new nominal genus *Barrandella* (: 241, 245) for those pentameroid brachiopods having the structure of *Atrypa linguifera* Sowerby.

5. Most later authors have accepted Hall & Clarke's interpretation (e.g. Schuchert & Cooper, 1932, *Mem. Peabody Mus. nat. Hist.* **4** (1) : 173, 181).

6. It appears to the present applicant however that the manner in which the name *Antirhynchonella* was published in 1871 in the index to Quenstedt's book cannot properly be regarded as acceptable. In the first place, there is no evidence at all that Quenstedt himself was responsible for the appearance of this name in the index to his book, it being just as probable that this entry in the index was due to a misreading of the passage on page 231 (quoted at the beginning of the present application) on the part of the compiler of the index. Second, even if Quenstedt himself compiled the index and was thus responsible for the appearance of the name *Antirhynchonella* on page 727, such a method of publication cannot, it is suggested, properly be held to have provided the name *Antirhynchonella* Quenstedt with an " indication " for the purposes of Proviso (*a*) to Article 25 of the *Règles*. For (as has been shown) the name *Antirhynchonella* does not appear on the page (: 231) cited in the index, the only reference on that page which can be held to have any connection with this subject being the vernacular word " Antirhynchonellen." But as long ago as 1907 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ruled (in its *Opinion* 1) that a " vernacular name " is not to be accepted as an " indication," and in 1948 this portion of *Opinion* 1 was incorporated into the *Règles* by the International Congress of Zoology (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 149). The conclusion inevitably follows that, even if Quenstedt did on the occasion cited above publish a generic name *Antirhynchonella*, that name as so published (on p. 727) must be regarded as being a *nomen nudum*, the reference there given being to page 231, where the name was mentioned only as a vernacular name.

7. In these circumstances the name *Antirhynchonella* dates for the purposes of the Law of Priority only from Oehlert, 1887, and the type species is unquestionably *Atrypa linguifera* Sowerby, 1839, the species then so designated by Oehlert. The acceptance of this species as the type species of *Antirhynchonella* runs counter to the interpretation given to it by Hall & Clarke and most later authors, but in the present case this is not a disadvantage, since *Pentamerus tenuistriatus* Walmstedt, the species accepted by Hall & Clarke as the type species of *Antirhynchonella*, is one, of which the internal structure has never, to my knowledge, been adequately defined, whereas the structure of *Atrypa linguifera* Sowerby has been closely studied and is well known. The only change following the acceptance of this species as the type species of *Antirhynchonella* Oehlert, 1877, will be the disappearance in synonymy of the name *Barrandella* Hall & Clarke, 1894, which is an objective synonym of *Antirhynchonella* Oehlert, having the same species as its type species. No serious inconvenience would follow this change ; it would not affect any name of supra-generic rank.

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked :—

(1) to rule that, as published in 1871 in the index to Quenstedt's *Die Brachiopoden* the name *Antirhynchonella* is a *nomen nudum :*

(2) to place the name *Antirhynchonella* Oehlert, 1887 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by original designation : *Atrypa linguifera* Sowerby (J. de C.), 1839) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :*

(3) to place the trivial name *linguifera* Sowerby (J. de C.), 1839 (as published in the binominal combination *Atrypa linguifera*) (trivial name of type species of *Antirhynchonella* Oehlert, 1887) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology :*

(4) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology ;—*

(*a*) the name *Antirhynchonella* Quenstedt, 1871 (a *nomen nudum*) ;

(*b*) the name *Barrandella* Hall & Clarke, 1894 (an objective junior synonym of *Antirhynchonella* Oehlert, 1887).

9. The problem dealt with in the present application has arisen in the course of the preparation of the section on pentamerid brachiopods for the forthcoming *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, and it will therefore be greatly appreciated if the International Commission can afford to this application all practicable priority.

ON THE PROPOSAL FOR THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF RULE (F) IN ARTICLE 30 OF THE RULES

By ERNST MAYR

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)539)

(Extract from a letter dated 31st October 1951)

I wonder whether the Rules should not have a reference to the status of generic names which are clearly substitute names for previously published generic names even though they do not conform with the new interpretation in Rule (f) in Article 30. Such a rule might merely be that all cases be submitted to the Commission. To leave these cases entirely up in the air—as it appears from the new restricted rulings —would seem unfortunate.

ON THE RELEVANCE TO THE AVAILABILITY OF A NAME OF THE AUTHOR'S INTENTIONS WHEN PUBLISHING THAT NAME; COMMENT ON VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MR. FRANCIS HEMMING

By H. OLDROYD, M.A.

(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in a note published in this *Bulletin* (Vol. 2 : 211) has expressed the view that an author's intentions not only are irrelevant (*Opinion* 4) but should be irrelevant to the availability of a published name. I should like to comment on the fundamental question of principle involved.

2. In the case quoted by Mr. Hemming (*Arieticeras* Quenstedt, 1883) and in another case which comes to my mind (*Bactria* Meigen, 1820) the author of the name concerned had no intention of proposing a new name that was to be used. He mentioned the name in passing for other reasons, commendable or otherwise. That such a name should be seized upon and brought into general use at the time of publication is unreasonable enough ; that it should be discovered decades later and used in preference to a long-established name seems to me incredibly perverse.

3. It is true that Mr. Hemming states that on the " rare " occasions when this occurs, the Commission could give a special ruling under its plenary powers. In my view, however, it is wrong in principle that the Code should permit such practices. In a science in which we are compelled to refer constantly to works published fifty, one hundred or even nearly two hundred years ago, it seems to me quite unreasonable obstinately to set aside the author's own intentions as merely " subjective " and to apply his names according to a set of rules devised a century after his death.

4. I do not believe it is possible to eliminate the " subjective " element from nomenclature, any more than this element can be " wholly excluded from any code of law," as Mr. Hemming would have it. English law, at any rate, is full of subjective elements, and the question of intention—with phrases such as "with malice aforethought," or " with intent to deceive "—is an integral part of it.

COMMENT ON MR. FRANCIS HEMMING'S NOTE ON AN ISSUE RAISED IN THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. W. J. ARKELL REGARDING THE NAMES " ARIETICERAS " SEGUENZA, 1885, and " SEGUENZICERAS " LEVI, 1896 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By HELMUTH HÖLDER

(*Geologisch-Paleontolisches Institut, University of Tübingen, Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

Zu *Arieticeras/Seguenziceras* (Arkell, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 208-210). Vor dem Vorschlag F. Hemming's (1951, *ibid*, **2** : 211-213), die Gültigkeit eines Namens unabhängig von der die Gültigkeit betreffenden Absicht seines Autors zu bejahen, ist nach Anzicht des Referenten zu warnen. Hier sollte durch denjeweils revidierenden Autor von Fall zu Fall entschieden werden. Die Namesform *Arieticeras* hat Quenstedt gegen *Arieticeras* Waagen angewogen, ohne, wie sich eindeutig erkennen lässt, die Einführung von *Arieticeras* in das Schriftum zu beabsichtigen. Es muss aber möglich sein, über die Form eines gegebenen Namens zu diskutieren, ohne dass eine erwogene andere Form sogleich nomenklatorische Gültigkeit erlangt. Der Name *Arieticeras* Seguenza ist also durch Quenstedt nicht präokkupiert und kann statt des viel schwerfälligeren, nichtsagenden *Seguenziceras* erhalten werden, wenn nicht nach Anzicht des Referenten nicht notwendige, dem entgegenstehende Allgemeinregelung im Sinne von F. Hemming erfolgt.

ON THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. W. J. ARKELL IN RELATION TO THE GENERIC NAME " ARIETICERAS " QUENSTEDT, 1883 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

(Enclosure to letter dated 24th October, 1951)

The advisability of validating Quenstedt's name *Arieticeras* (Arkell, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 208-210) seems to me to be somewhat questionable. I am not a specialist in this group, but as Dr. H. Engel has stated the case (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 337) it would seem to be parallel to that of Lea's name *Megasystrophia* for the suppression of which an application has already been submitted to you. In each case the author felt that a new name was not necessary at the time, and so did not use the one which he had given, but he gave it nevertheless, to meet the exigency that it might be needed in the future. This method of establishing new genera appears to me to be neither logical nor efficient nor desirable.

Not being a specialist on this group I do not ask the Commission to take action either way on this application, but I would ask that the question of whether *Megasystrophia* be validated or suppressed be considered at the same time in order that consistent results may be arrived at.

" ANIMUS NOMINANDI " AN INDISPENSABLE REQUIREMENT FOR THE CREATION OF A VALID NAME

By OTTO HAAS
(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)486)

(Enclosure to letter dated 29th October, 1951)

In his comment with regard to the above reference Mr. Francis Hemming (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **2**: 211-213) considers it irrelevant whether or not an author publishing a taxonomic name intended it to be used as such.*

Mr. Hemming's view appears, however, to be incompatible with the principle, quite generally accepted in law, that acts lacking seriousness of intention cannot produce any legal effects. Thus, Roman law requires " *animus possidende* " to make possession, or " *animus donandi* " to make a donation, legal. A mere going through the forms of donation without the true intention to donate cannot produce a legal donation.

It is believed that, similarly, what might be called " *animus nominandi* " is required for the valid creation of a taxonomic name. A name published without such intention, like *Arieticeras* Quenstedt, 1803, cannot acquire any rights under the *Règles*. Since this result follows from the general principle referred to above, no special provision to this effect—as considered, but decidedly declined by Mr. Hemming—need be introduced into the *Règles*.

* Dr. H. Engel (*ibid.* : 337) questions Dr. Arkell's conclusion that, in the case under consideration, Quenstedt clearly had no intention of validly publishing the generic name *Arieticeras*. Dr. Engel's arguments do not seem to be convincing. Anyway, the present discussion is based on Dr. Arkell's above conclusion.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS ON THE QUESTION WHETHER IT SHOULD BE AN ESSENTIAL CONDITION TO THE AVAILABILITY OF A NAME THAT THE AUTHOR BY WHOM IT WAS PUBLISHED INTENDED THAT THE NAME IN QUESTION SHOULD BE USED AS A SCIENTIFIC NAME IN ZOOLOGY

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)486 and 668)

Among the applications relating to the names of ammonites submitted to the Commission by Dr. W. J. Arkell, that relating to the names *Arieticeras* Seguenza, 1885, and *Seguenziceras* Levi, 1896 (Arkell, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 208-210) raised a question of principle of general application. This question was whether a name (in this case, the name *Arieticeras* Seguenza, 1885) should be rejected as a junior homonym when the same word (*Arieticeras*) had previously been published by some author (in the present instance by Quenstedt in 1883) in conditions which showed or implied that the name in question had been published by that author for some reason other than to serve as a scientific name for an animal.

2. In a note published at the same time (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 211-213) I discussed the implications of the problem involved. In approaching this subject, I was primarily concerned to draw attention to the threat to nomenclatorial stability represented by any decision under which it would be legitimate to reject as nomenclatorially unavailable any otherwise available name, on the ground that, although that name had been duly published with an indication, the author by whom it had been published had never intended it to be used as the scientific name of the animal concerned and had published it with some other object, for example, for the purpose either of ridiculing some other author or of criticising what he (the author by whom the name was published) considered to be the excessive tendency of some author to subdivide taxonomic units unnecessarily and therefore to publish unneeded new names. For, as I then pointed out, the introduction into the *Règles* of a provision containing a subjective test of the foregoing kind would be contrary to the interests of nomenclatorial stability, as it would be impossible under such a provision to obtain a final and definite answer, it being open to any zoologist to form his own opinion on the question whether a given name had been published in order that it should be used as such or whether it had been published for some other reason. I therefore formed the view that it would be a mistake to insert into the *Règles* a provision invalidating names on the ground discussed above.

3. The question at issue has since been the subject of an interesting discussion in a series of notes by the following authors : H. Engel (*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 337) ; H. Oldroyd (*British Museum (Natural History)*) (1952, *ibid.* **6** : 245) ; Helmuth Hölder (*Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut, University of Tübingen*) (*ibid.* **6** : 245) ; Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (*ibid.* **6** : 246) ; Otto Haas (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) (*ibid.* **6** : 246).

4. Two points emerge clearly from this discussion : (1) The differences of opinion expressed as to Quenstedt's intentions when he published the name *Arieticeras* confirm the presumption that it will often be a matter of difference of opinion as to whether in a case of this kind the author concerned did or did not intend the name which he published to be treated as available for use as a scientific name. (2) The general consensus of opinion appears to be that the intention to give a scientific name—rather happily styled by Dr. Haas as "*animus nominandi*"—ought to be regarded as an essential condition to a published name acquiring "availability" under the *Règles*.

5. If, as may, I think, now be expected, this view on the question of availability is that generally favoured by zoologists, it will be necessary to consider how best the general proposition involved may be given formal recognition in the *Règles*. I suggest for consideration that a convenient method would be one modelled on the decision taken by the International Congress of Zoology in relation to the determination of the species to be accepted as the type species of a genus based (or alleged to be based) upon a misidentified type species. The two cases are, in essence, very similar, for, just as it is now suggested that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that the intention to give a name on the part of a given author should be made an essential condition to the acceptance as available of a name published by that author, so in the earlier case it was argued that means should be found for ensuring that (other things being equal) the intention (or *animus*) of an author, when designating a given nominal species to be the type species of a new genus or when including in such a genus a nominal species later selected to be the type species, should not be frustrated by reason of the fact that that author misidentified the species with which he was dealing and mistakenly applied to it a name properly applicable to some other species.

6. In the case of a genus based upon a misidentified type species, the International Congress of Zoology (on the advice of the Commission) agreed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* laying down the proposition (originally enunciated by the Commission in its *Opinion* 65) that the author of a generic name is to be assumed to have correctly identified the species placed by him in the nominal genus so named, save that, where specialists are of the opinion that the author of such a name misidentified the species which he designated as the type species or which, if no species was so designated, was later selected to be the type species, the case is to be referred to the International Commission for decision (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 158-159).

7. The foregoing solution of the problem presented by the name of a genus based upon a misidentified type species provided a means for recognising the intention of the author of the name of a genus, while at the same time ensuring that stability and uniformity in nomenclature should not be endangered through an opening being given for the adoption by individual zoologists of discordant subjective views as to the intention of the original author. It is accordingly suggested for consideration that a suitable means for dealing with the present problem would be provided by the adoption of a provision prescribing that the author of a name is to be assumed to have published that name for use as a scientific name, save that, where any specialist

is of the opinion that a given name was not published with the foregoing intention, he should refer the case to the Commission which, if satisfied that the objection to the name is well founded, may direct that the name is to be treated as having no availability in zoological nomenclature.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAME " SIRTALIS " LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " COLUBER SIRTALIS ") (CLASS REPTILIA) SUBMITTED BY DR. HERNDON G. DOWLING

By SHERMAN A. MINTON, Jr.

(*Indiana University Medical Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)433)

(Letter dated 13th March 1952)

I have been asked to express to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature my view relative to the problem of nomenclature involved in the dual usage of the name, *Thamnophis sirtalis*, for the North American ribbon snake and for the common garter snake of North America (Reference Number, Z.N.(S.) 433). The proposal of Schmidt and Conant (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** (3) : 67-69) being essentially a return to the status prior to 1948, might well create the least confusion among those non-systematists and workers in other fields who are not familiar with the issues involved. The proposal of Dowling (1951, *Copeia* **1951** (4) : 309-310), however, seems more in accord with sound taxonomic procedure and would appear to offer the more desirable course of action.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAME " SIRTALIS " LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " COLUBER SIRTALIS ") (CLASS REPTILIA) SUBMITTED BY DR. KARL P. SCHMIDT AND MR. ROGER CONANT

By HAROLD A. DUNDEE

(*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Laurence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)433)

(Letter dated 18th March 1952)

It has been suggested by Mr. Herndon Dowling that the various herpetologists contact you with reference to nomenclatorial action on the name *Thamnophis sirtalis* (Linnaeus) (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)433).

It is the opinion of this worker that continuity is more significant than priority in the above case. It is therefore my wish that the proposal of Schmidt and Conant be accepted.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIRTALIS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "COLUBER SIRTALIS") SUBMITTED BY DR. KARL P. SCHMIDT AND MR. ROGER CONANT

By GEO. A. MOORE and BRYAN P. GLASS,

(*Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Oklahoma, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)433)

(Letter dated 22nd April, 1952)

As members of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, we favor the proposal of Schmidt and Conant over that of Dowling regarding the status of the names *Thamnophis sirtalis* (Linnaeus) and *Thamnophis sauritus* (Linnaeus).

COMMENTS ON DR. MUIR-WOOD'S TWO PROPOSALS FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH NAMES DIFFERING IN THEIR ORTHOGRAPHY SHOULD BE REGARDED AS IDENTICAL FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

By K. H. L. KEY

(*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, Canberra, Australia*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.) 530 and 538)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 7th January 1952)

I refer to the two applications to the International Commission made by Dr. Muir-Wood under the Commission's References ; Z.N.(S.)530 and 538, and published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, vol. 6, pp. 90-94. These applications propose that the Commission should further extend the grounds upon which names differing in their orthography should be regarded as identical for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy. I am strongly opposed to any such extension.

In my view the mandatory provisions of the *Règles* relating to the formation of names in Zoology are already far too complicated, chiefly because they concern themselves with issues that are completely irrelevant to the aim of providing an easily applied, efficacious system of nomenclature. Among such issues must be included all questions of transliteration and etymology, and of the grammar of the Latin and Greek languages. It is, indeed, a serious reflexion upon the rationality of our system of nomenclature that it should be possible to devote nearly five pages of print to a discussion of whether two names of different spelling should be regarded as identical.

Unfortunately, the *Règles* as they stand provide ample excuse for such discussions. Very simple and perfectly effective rules for the formation of names could be adopted which would remove all necessity for taxonomists to waste their time on matters of this kind. I do not propose, at this stage, to make any formal suggestions along these lines, but it is easy to see the general directions in which simplification should be effected. In the first place, the rule that the Latin alphabet should be used should be rigidly construed, so as to eliminate all diacritic marks, which do not occur in the Latin language. Secondly, any difference in orthography between two names as originally proposed should imply a difference in the names, irrespective of considerations of transliteration, etymology, etc. Thirdly, the only limitations that should be imposed on an author in forming a name are that the name should be binominal, that each of the words composing it should be of more than one letter, and that the first word (the generic name) should be written with a capital initial letter and the second (the specific trivial name) with a small letter, *i.e.* there should be no mandatory provisions relating to transliteration, gender, number, grammatical agreement of adjective with noun, names based on patronymics, etc. Adoption of rules such as these would almost eliminate the vexed question of emendation of wrongly-formed names and would avoid the necessity for taxonomists to concern themselves with fine points of grammar and orthography in foreign and essentially dead languages. Each name would need to be no more than a distinctive combination of letters, preferably pronouncable, of course. Those who wish to employ Latin or Greek constructions would be free to do so, and Recommendations could be included in the *Règles* advocating that and other practices, but no question of emendation would arise from such Recommendations.

I think it is high time that zoologists gave serious attention to the merits of a simple set of rules of this kind, and perhaps no better occasion for starting discussion on the subject will arise than that provided by the publication of Dr. Muir-Wood's two proposals.

I realize that my opposition to the proposal that the presence or absence of diacritic marks should be ignored for purposes of the Law of Homonymy may appear inconsistent with my views that diacritic marks should be disallowed altogether. However the present *Règles* do allow, and indeed require, the use of diacritic marks in certain circumstances, and what I am chiefly concerned to prevent is a further complication of already complicated provisions by the acceptance of yet another category of ostensible differences between names which must nevertheless be ignored for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy.

ON DR. HELEN MUIR-WOOD'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE TREATMENT TO BE ACCORDED, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY, OF NAMES CONSISTING OF SUCH WORDS AS "JAKOWLEFFIA" AND "YAKOVLEVIA"

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.

(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)530)

(Enclosure to letter dated 24th October, 1951)

I am completely in sympathy with this application (Muir-Wood, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 90-92) and wish to support it.

ON THE QUESTION RAISED BY DR. HELEN MUIR-WOOD WHETHER TWO NAMES DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER ONLY BY THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE RESPECTIVELY OF A DIACRITIC MARK SHOULD BE REGARDED AS HOMONYMS OF ONE ANOTHER

By E. M. HERING
(*Zoological Museum, Berlin, Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

(Extracts from letters dated 11th August and 26th September, 1951)

A. Letter dated 11th August, 1951

In answer to your question whether generic names differing from one another only by the presence in one case and the absence in the other of a diacritic mark should be regarded as homonyms, I give you my opinion on the four points raised :—

(1) Words differing by reason of a diacritic mark possess in most cases a different pronounciation and mostly a different sense. Zoological names differing in this manner are derived from different words and should not be regarded as homonyms.

(2) The difference between two zoological names so created is sufficient to make them suitable for concurrent use in every case. It is not desirable that the *Règles* should provide that any pair of such names should be treated as homonyms of one another. (Törnquist means thorn-twig, Tornquist means literally tower-twig. In the Czechoslovak language r is spoken = r, but ř is spoken rsh and words differing in " r " and " ř " have a different sense !)

(3) In the example of " Mülleria " and " Mulleria " the diacritic mark is sufficient to distinguish the two names ; the difference points out also the difference between the grandfather and grandson !*

(4) In the present language use Tornquist cannot be regarded as a German name ; in the most cases one may assume that this is the surname of a man, the ancestors of whom came from Sweden. But there are so many names in German which were common to Germany and Sweden in older times that it may be that in some parts of Germany there are to be found families bearing names identical or nearly identical with Swedish names. There are also many names in Sweden with alternative modes of spelling but with the same sense, especially the composita with twig : -quist, -qvist, -kvist, etc. All these have the same sense and the same pronounciation, but zoological names derived from these composita cannot be regarded as homonyms of another. There is no other possibility than to use them as different zoological names, and the same must be binding for the names differing by reason of a diacritic mark.

*The reference here is to a question in my letter to Dr. Hering of 5th August, 1951, regarding a hypothetical case in which a generic name *Mülleria* was based upon the name of a German zoologist and another generic name *Mulleria* without an umlaut based on the name of the foregoing zoologist's grandson who was an American citizen and who had discontinued the use of the umlaut. (Signed) Francis Hemming, 5th February, 1951.

B. Letter dated 26th September, 1951

I have corresponded with my Czech friend Dalibor Povolný and I asked him for the name of the diacritic mark " ˇ " in the Czech language. I now give you his remarks on this matter. He tells me that all his colleagues at Brno hold the same opinion as that expressed in my last letter on this matter.

The Czech name of this diacritic mark is " háček " (pronounced hatcheck) ; this name means " a little hook."

The effect of this mark which can occur above the majority of the consonants (and above some vowels also) is to soften the sound. Thus " c " is pronounced as " ts," but " č " is pronounced as " tch " or " cz " as in the word Czech (čechič). The letter " s " is pronounced as " ss," but " š " as " sh." Again the letter " z " is pronounced as " z " (in the word " zoological "), and the letter " ž " as " j " (in the word " journal "). The letter " r " is the normal " r," but the letter " ř " is not found in the English or German languages ; it comes near to " rj." The letters with the " háček " are found in other Slav languages as self-dependent letters.

It is not possible to homonymise words, in which in one case the letter is written without, in the other, with, the diacritic mark " háček." In every case the two words possess their own pronounciation and, what is more important, their own sense. There was described a Thysanopter to the honour of the paleontologist Frič (pronounced Fritch) as *Thaeniothrips fričí*. If this name were to be written as *frici*, then it would be pronounced " fritsi," and this would sound as though the species had been named after a German named Fritz.

The name of the well known Czech entomologist Šulc is pronounced like the German name Schulz, and if a hypothetical generic name Šulcia were written without the hook, it would not be pronounced as in English " Shoultsia " but " Ssoultsia."

So I cannot see any other possibility than to treat two different names the one with, the other without, a diacritic mark as separate and not homonym names.

ON THE SIGNIFICANCE TO BE ATTACHED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY TO THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF A DIACRITIC MARK

By LEIF STØRMER

(*Paleontologisk Institutt, Oslo, Norway*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

(Letter dated 29th August, 1951)

Concerning your : " Question whether generic names differing from one another only by the presence in one case and the absence in the other of a diacritic mark over one of the letters should be regarded as homonyms," my opinion is as follows :—

(1) In the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) as well as in Germany, the letters o and ö are distinctly different vowels. They are pronounced differently and words such as " stor "—meaning great or large—and " stör "—meaning sturgeon—are distinctly different words.

(2) I think, as a consequence of what is said above, that scientific names containing the letters o and ö, but otherwise similar, should be treated as separate names. This also implies that families and Orders could be established with names only separable by the diacrite mark.

(3) It may create some confusion that some persons drop the umlaut in their names. In spite of this, I would prefer to maintain o and ö, and u and ü as separate letters, distinguishing different zoological names. This would mean that, if there exists a name *Mülleria* it would be possible also to establish a new genera *Mulleria* based on a person by name Muller, even if that person or his ancestors once used the name Müller.

This of course may cause confusion. It would seem rather absurd if a person by the name of Müller obtained a genus *Mülleria* and if afterwards he changed his name to Muller and in addition obtained a genus *Mulleria* ! But even so, I would stick to the principle and only recommend the latter naming not to be done.

(4) I think (but I am not sure) that Tornquist is a German name, not a germanized version of the Swedish Törnquist.

In the Scandinavian countries you will find both ö and ø. These are *identical* letters, ö is used in Sweden and ø in Denmark and Norway. The letters are the same as oe in other languages. Since ö is better known outside Scandinavia than ø, I think that ö might be used internationally even in Norwegian and Danish names. (The letter ø makes trouble in printing outside Scandinavia.) You may also know that ü and y are identical and correspond to " ue " abroad.

ON THE USE OF DIACRITIC MARKS OVER LETTERS IN WORDS USED AS ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

(Enclosure to letter dated 24th October 1951)

I would suggest that it would be advisable to rule that generic and specific trivial names (in the broad sense of these terms) derived from German patronymics and which contain the letters ä, ö, ü be spelled with these letters transliterated as ae, oe, ue. This, I have been informed, was the original spelling, the umlaut being the schematized form of the modifying vowel, which at one time was written above the vowel which was modified. This schematized form is identical with that of the Latin diaeresis, which has a widely different meaning ; in fact the diaeresis in Spanish is not the same thing as the diaeresis in English. Also I have been informed that the Scandinavian umlaut is not the same as the German umlaut, but I am not sure on this point. I am not opposed to the use of diacritic marks in general ; in fact, I think we will have to have recourse to them in the transliteration of words from languages using the Latin alphabet but which have supernumerary letters that do not occur in Latin. The disadvantages of using symbols which have more than one meaning is too obvious to need further comment ; my objection applies only to ambiguous diacritic marks.

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF A DIACRITIC MARK SHOULD BE HELD TO MAKE TWO NAMES CONSISTING OF OTHERWISE IDENTICAL WORDS DISTINCT NAMES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

By ERNST MAYR

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

(Extract from a letter dated 31st October 1951)

Bull. zool. Nomencl., vol. 6, page 114 : I strongly endorse Dr. Stubblefield's opinion. There are two kinds of diacritical marks, one to indicate that two successive vowels be pronounced separately rather than as a diphthong, the second one to indicate in certain languages that the vowel with which is associated is an entirely different sound than the vowel without the diacritical mark. The latter kind of diacritical mark is, in a manner of speaking, part of the vowel and makes the total a very different letter. For these reasons it would be incorrect to equate ö with o. In the case cited by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood no possible confusion can arise since the two generic names refer to forms belonging to different phyla of animals and occurring at totally different geological times. To equate o and ö would set a precedent which might well lead to widespread and most undesirable name changing.

ON THE PROBLEM OF THE STATUS OF NAMES PUBLISHED BY SCOPOLI IN 1777 IN HIS "INTRODUCTIO AD HISTORIAM NATURALEM"

By GEORGE S. MYERS

(*Stanford University, Natural History Museum, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)587)

(Extract from a letter dated 29th January, 1952)

I have noticed in a recent issue of the *Bulletin* a discussion (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** (4) : 122-125) a discussion of some of the generic names proposed by Scopoli, 1777, *Introductio ad Historiam naturalem*. It seemed to me that some feeling was shown that Scopoli should be nomenclaturally outlawed. This would be catastrophic in ichthyology, where the outlawing of Scopoli's names would mean the replacement of a number of very important generic names. The more important Scopolian fish names are : **Liparis*, **Umbra*, **Clarias*, *Percis*, **Anableps*, **Pholis*, **Erythrinus*, **Anostomus*, **Mastacembelus*, **Synodus*, *Mystus*, **Channa*, **Holocentrus*, **Callichthys*, **Gonorhynchus*, *Aspredo*, **Albula*, **Charax*.

An asterisk indicates that the name is the type genus of a currently recognized family. Some of these families are large and important.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. LAURENCE M. KLAUBER REGARDING THE TRIVIAL NAMES "ATROX" BAIRD & GIRARD, 1853 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "CROTALUS ATROX") AND "POLYSTICTA" COPE, 1865 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "CAUDISONA POLYSTICTA") RESPECTIVELY (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER SQUAMATA)

By HOBART M. SMITH,

(*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)523 and 524)

(Letter dated 28th April, 1952)

It does not appear to me that *Crotalus cinereous* Le Conte, 1852, is an available name, but that upon careful consideration other conclusion is possible has been well demonstrated. In such controversial matters a complete analysis of the various interpretations involved is not needed nearly as much as a simple establishment by the Commission of the proper name. In this case there can be no question that conservation of *atrox* would best serve nomenclatural stability.

There is less reason for uncertainty regarding availability of *multimaculata*, which clearly, in the interest of stability should be suppressed at the same time that *polystictus* is placed on the *Official List.*

Both the recommendations suggested by Dr. Klauber have much merit in eliminating possible causes for confusion, and commendable also is his prompt adoption of the long-needed procedure for conserving long-recognized names which by strict application of the rules would be changed. This is certaintly one of the most important advances of nomenclatorial procedure in a good many years. We can now anticipate a real decrease in the alarming rate of name changes.

SUPPORT FOR DR. LAURENCE KLAUBER'S PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAMES "ATROX" BAIRD & GIRARD, 1853 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "CROTALUS ATROX") AND "POLYSTICTA" COPE, 1865 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "CAUDISONA POLYSTICTA") RESPECTIVELY (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER SQUAMATA)

By KARL P. SCHMIDT, D. DWIGHT DAVIS AND CLIFFORD H. POPE,

(*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)523 and 524)

(Letter dated 29th April, 1952)

We wish to support the application of Dr. L. M. Klauber regarding the name *Crotalus atrox* versus *Crotalus cinereous* and *Crotalus polystictus* as against *Crotalus multimaculatus.*

Contents

(*continued from front wrapper*)

(a) New Applications

Page

(1) Proposed use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for the genus *Ancylus* Müller, 1774 (Class Gastropoda) in harmony with established nomenclatorial practice. By Bengt Hubendick (*Riksmuseum, Stockholm*) 227

(2) Proposed addition of the name *Ancylastrum* Bourguignat, 1853 (Class Gastropoda) to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. By Bengt Hubendick (*Riksmuseum, Stockholm*) 230

(3) Proposed use of the plenary powers to preserve for the Western Diamond Rattlesnake the trivial name *atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 (as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox*) by suppressing the trivial name *cinereous* Le Conte *in* Hallowell, 1852 (as published in the combination *Crotalus cinereous*) (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata). By Laurence M. Klauber (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 234

(4) Proposed use of the plenary powers to preserve the trivial name *polysticta* Cope, 1865 (as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta*) for the Mexican Lance-headed Rattlesnake, by suppressing the trivial name *multimaculata* Jan, 1863 (as published in the combination *Crotalus lugubris* var. *multimaculata*) (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata). By Laurence M. Klauber (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 236

(5) Proposed use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for the genus *Palaeopsylla* Wagner, 1903 (Class Insecta, Order Siphonaptera) in harmony with the generally accepted use of that term. By G. H. E. Hopkins (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts*) 239

(6) Request for a ruling that the alleged name *Antirhynchonella* Quenstedt, 1871, is a *nomen nudum* (Phylum Brachiopoda, Class Articulata). By Thomas W. Amsden (*The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) 242

(7) Further considerations on the question whether it should be an essential condition to the availability of a name that the author by whom it was published intended that the name in question should be used as a scientific name in zoology. By Francis Hemming (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 247

(b) Comments on applications already received

(8) Mr. C. W. Wright's application on the name *Hoplites* Neumayr, 1875: comment by R. Casey (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) .. 241

(9) Mr. Francis Hemming's proposal for the adoption of a *Declaration* clarifying the meaning of Rule (f) in Article 30 of the Rules: comment by Ernst Mayr (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 244

(10) Dr. W. J. Arkell's proposal relating to the name *Arieticeras* Seguenza, 1885: Comments by (1) H. Oldroyd (*British Museum (Natural History), London;* (2) Helmuth Hölder (*Geologisch-Paleontologisches Institut, University of Tübingen, Germany*); (3) Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*); (4) Otto Haas (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) (see also Item (7) above) 245

Contents

(continued from overleaf)

Page

(11) The Schmidt/Conant proposal and the Dowling counter-proposal relating to the trivial name *sirtalis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Coluber sirtalis*) : comments by : (1) Sherman A. Minton, Jr. (*Indiana University Medical Center, Indianopolis, Indiana, U.S.A.*) ; (2) Harold A. Dundee (*University of Kansas, Laurence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) ; (3) Geo. A. Moore & Bryan P. Glass (*Oklahoma Agricultural & Mechanical College, Stillwater, Oklahoma, U.S.A.*) 249

(12) Dr. Helen Muir-Wood's proposals relating to the orthography of names based upon proper names transcribed from the Cyrillic alphabet : Comments by : (1) K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia*) ; (2) Joshua L. Bailey, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 250

(13) Dr. Helen Muir-Wood's proposals relating to the significance to be attached to the use or omission respectively of diacritic marks over letters in words used as zoological names : Comments by : (1) K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia*) ; (2) E. M. Hering (*Zoologisch Museum, Berlin*) ; (3) Leif Störmer (*Paleontologisk Institut, Oslo, Norway*) ; (4) Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) ; (5) Ernst Mayr (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 250, 252

(14) Mr. Francis Hemming's proposal relating to the status of names in Scopoli, 1777, *Introductio ad Historiam naturalem* : Comment by George S. Myers (*Stanford University, Natural History Museum, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 255

(15) Dr. Laurence M. Klauber's proposal relating to the trivial name *atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 (as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox*): Comments by : (1) Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) ; (2) Karl P. Schmidt, D. Dwight Davis and Clifford H. Pope (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) .. 256

(16) Dr. Laurence M. Klauber's proposal relating to the trivial name *polysticta* Cope, 1865 (as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta*) : Comments by : (1) Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) ; (2) Karl P. Schmidt, D. Dwight Davis and Clifford H. Pope (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) .. 256

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Zoologists proposing to submit applications to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are invited to study carefully any application dealing with a similar problem that may already have been published in the *Bulletin*, in order thereby to secure that their applications are prepared in the requisite manner and contain all the information necessary to enable the Commission to reach a decision on the issues involved. In addition, such zoologists will assist the Commission and promote the early consideration of their applications, if they submit those applications (1) in duplicate, and (2) typed, double-spaced, on one side of the paper only and with wide margins. All new applications and all comments on previously published applications should be addressed to Francis Hemming, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON LTD., Westminster, London